

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.6825 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2025 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

Satish Kumar Son of Paryag Mahto Resident of village - Karaye, P.S.-
Masaurhi, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The Vigilance Department, Bihar, Patna Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Ms. Eashita Raj, Advocate
		Mr. Anuj Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s :		Mr. Arvind Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5 30-04-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned counsel for the Vigilance.

2. The petitioner seeks regular bail in connection with
Vigilance P.S. Case No. 89 of 2025 registered for the offence
under Section(s) 7(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner was
allegedly caught red-handed while demanding and accepting a
bribe of Rs. 3,000/- from the complainant for removing
objections and facilitating completion of the complainant's
mutation work.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. It is
also submitted that the petitioner is in judicial custody since



10.10.2025 and the charge-sheet has already been filed. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case by the complainant in alleged collusion with Vigilance personnel. The prosecution story is highly improbable, false, and fabricated, appearing to be the result of a malicious conspiracy between the complainant and the Vigilance authorities. The allegations against the petitioner are based merely on assumptions and presumptions, without any material evidence or valid basis to substantiate them.

5. It is further submitted that the petitioner is only a Data Entry Operator posted at the Anchal Office, Kako, holding a purely ministerial and subordinate position. The petitioner has no statutory power, discretion or authority to dispose of mutation applications, remove objections, or pass any order affecting revenue records. The entire decision-making authority in mutation matters vests exclusively with the Circle Officer, who is the competent authority.

6. Learned counsel for the Vigilance Department has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

7. Considering the submissions of the parties, the nature of allegations, the period of custody of the petitioner, and the fact that charge-sheet has already been submitted, this



application for regular bail is allowed.

8. Accordingly, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Vigilance P.S. Case No. 89 of 2025.

9. It is made clear that any observation made herein is *prima facie* in nature and limited solely for the purpose of adjudication of the present bail application. Such observations shall not be construed as an expression on the merits of the case and shall not influence the trial or any other proceedings in any manner.

(Sandeep Kumar, J)

Shishir/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

